MARKED-UP VERSION OF AMENDMENTS

Claim 15 has been canceled.

Claims 8 and 11-13 have been amended as follows:

8. (Twice Amended) Process for making a paper comprising a pattern embossed on at least one side, said pattern being constituted by the combination of at least one ground and at least one inlaid area, at least one of the grounds and at least one of the inlaid areas having wefts with different slants and shapes, wherein the paper is made on a cylinder paper machine, and by means of a vat paper machine comprising a cylinder, a pick-up felt and a wet press having a top felt, said process comprising the following steps:

- a wet sheet of cellulose fibers comprising water is formed by means of said
cylinder,

- the wet sheet is picked up by the pick-up felt and is carried between said wet press to remove the water, and

- the sheet of cellulose fibers is dried,

wherein the embossed pattern is obtained by the imprint of formed on said sheet before it is dried by applying thereon a cloth that is placed directly on the cylinder, or in place of the pick-up felt, or in place of the upper top felt on the wet presses, said cloth being metallic or made of plastic material, and said cloth being woven and comprising a pattern, said pattern being constituted by a combination of at least

one ground and at least one inlaid area, the ground and the inlaid area having wefts with different slants and shapes.

- 11. (Twice Amended) Cloth to be used in a process of making a paper according to claim 8, wherein said cloth is woven and has a pattern, said pattern being A woven cloth comprising a pattern constituted by the combination of at least one ground and at least one inlaid area, the ground and the inlaid area having wefts with different slants and shapes, wherein said cloth is made of a metallic or plastic material.
- 12. (Twice Amended) Cloth Woven cloth according to claim 11, wherein said cloth is woven in a single piece comprising the ground and at least one inlaid area.
- 13. (Twice Amended) Cloth Woven cloth according to claim 11, wherein said cloth is constituted by a ground having a weft with a certain slant, in which one or several areas have been cut out and replaced by one or several inlaid areas with a weft slanting in a different direction from that of the ground, the areas being assembled by stitching, welding or gluing at the contour of the areas or by any other process suitable for attaching the inlaid area or areas.

New claims 16-17 have been added.

<u>REMARKS</u>

By the present amendment, claim 15 has been canceled, claims 8 and 11-13 have been amended, and new claims 16-17 have been added.

Claims 8, 11-13 and 16-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 8 and 16-17 are directed to a process for making a paper and claims 11-13 are directed to a cloth to be used in a process of making a paper according to claim 8.

In the Office Action, the claims are objected to as being generally narrative and indefinite, and claim 8 is objected to because it is alleged that the terms "the imprint", "the pick-up felt", "the upper felt" and "the wet press" lack antecedent basis.

The claims have been rewritten to recite more clearly and positively the steps and features of the claimed process. Further, the term "the imprint" has been deleted and the other terms which were objected to in the Office Action have been introduced in claim 8 to provide antecedent basis. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objections should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. It is alleged that claim 11 substantially replicates claim 8 and is unclear.

Claim 11 has been rewritten independently from claim 8 to clarify that claim 11 is directed to a cloth whereas claim 8 is directed to a process. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 8, 11-13 and 15 are rejected udner 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 361,849 (Taylor) in view of US 2,890,540 (Britt). It is alleged in the Office

Action that Taylor discloses using a fabric attached to a belt to create a fabric pattern and Britt discloses a "damask" fabric pattern, so that it would have been obvious to modify the process of Taylor to obtain a "damask" pattern as in Britt.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Taylor is directed to a process for making paper having an embossed pattern by applying on wet paper a fabric having the desired pattern. The imprint is made between couch-rolls and drying rolls (see Taylor at page 1, lines 24-25). The fabric is made of vegetal, animal, or analogous fibers (see Taylor at page 1, line 80). Thus, the fabric forms a "soft textile medium" (Taylor at page 1, line 101). In particular, Taylor indicates that fabric that is "loosely woven" will give the best results (Taylor at page 2, lines 102-107).

It is submitted that the fabric of Taylor is not capable of forming a damask pattern on paper. To obtain a damask pattern on wet paper, a fabric having an embossed pattern formed of points or dashes arranged in parallel lines is used. These points or dashes are disposed sufficiently close to each other to confer the damask aspect to the paper. In addition, the fabric penetrates in the wet paper to an extent sufficient to form points or dashes that are appropriately individualized, otherwise the points or dashes are not formed or are not formed clearly enough to constitute a damask pattern. A loosely woven fabric made of vegetal or animal fibers as disclosed in Taylor is totally incapable of having a sufficiently detailed embossed pattern which could penetrate wet paper in a manner sufficient to create a damask pattern. Thus, Taylor teaches away from using a fabric to obtain a damask pattern on paper. As a result, there would have been no motivation

to replace the engraved metal roll of Britt by a fabric such as the loosely woven fabric of Taylor to obtain a damask pattern. Further, any attempt to make damask patterns on paper with the fabric disclosed in Taylor would result in failure.

In contrast, the process of the presently claimed invention uses a cloth which is metallic or made of plastic material, as recited in present claims 8 and 11. Unlike the fabric made of vegetal or animal fibers of Taylor, the metallic or plastic cloth makes it possible to have a closely embossed pattern and a good penetration of wet paper to form a distinctly individualized pattern, in particular on wet paper which still contains an important amount of water. This feature of the presently claimed invention and its advantages are not taught or suggested in any of the cited references, and therefore, the present claims are not obvious over any combination of these references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Britt.

Claim 15 has been canceled. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection is moot.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP

Nicolas E. Seckel

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 000531

Suite 1000 1725 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 Tel: (202) 659-2930

Tel: (202) 659-2930 Fax: (202) 887-0357

NES:rep

Encl.: Petition for Three-Month Extension of Time

Request for Continued Examination